

UNITED STATES PARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 097890,875 08/07/01 OHNOGI OHNOGI=1 001444 **EXAMINER** HM12/1023 BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. HUI,S 624 NINTH STREET, NW SUITE 300 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER WASHINGTON DC 20001-5303 1617 4 DATE MAILED: 10/23/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

•			
Office Action Summary		Application N .	Applicant(s)
		09/890,875	OHNOGI ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		San-ming Hui	1617
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status			
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u> </u>	
2a) <u></u>		s action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.			
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.			
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)[2	☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents		
	 Certified copies of the priority documents 	have been received in Applicat	ion No
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 			
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).			
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.			
Attachment(s)			
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 1617

DETAILED ACTION

Warning

Applicant is advised that should claim 1 be found allowable, claim 2 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Two claims that are both drawn to composition claims comprising the same active agents. Please note that the recitation of "intended use", e.g., for treating and preventing a disease, or enhancing growth factor production, does not lend patentable weight to composition claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for 4,5-dihydroxy-2-cyclopenten-1-one, for 4-hydroxy-2-cyclopenten-1-one, and their derivatives disclosed in page 12, line 20 – page 23, line 9, does not reasonably provide enablement for other derivatives of 4,5-dihydroxy-2-cyclopenten-1-one and for 4-hydroxy-2-cyclopenten-1-one. The

Art Unit: 1617

specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence of absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention.
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

Applicant fails to set forth the criteria that defines what "derivatives of 4,5-dihydroxy-2-cyclopenten-1-one and for 4-hydroxy-2-cyclopenten-1-one" are.

Additionally, Applicant fails to provide information allowing the skilled artisan to ascertain these compounds without undue experimentation. In the instant case, only a limited number of "derivatives of 4,5-dihydroxy-2-cyclopenten-1-one and for 4-hydroxy-

Art Unit: 1617

2-cyclopenten-1-one" examples are set forth, thereby failing to provide sufficient working examples. It is noted that these examples are neither exhaustive, nor define the class of compounds required. The pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. The instant claims read on <u>all</u> "derivatives of 4,5-dihydroxy-2-cyclopenten-1-one and for 4-hydroxy-2-cyclopenten-1-one", necessitating an exhaustive search for the embodiments suitable to practice the claimed invention. Applicants fail to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The expression "4,5-dihydroxy-2-cyclopenten-1-one, 4-hydroxy-2-cyclopenten-1-one, and derivatives thereof" renders the claims in definite as to the compounds encompassed by the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 1617

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koyama et al. (WO 98/13328).

Koyama et al. teaches a pharmaceutical composition containing 4,5-dihydroxy-2-cyclopenten-1-one (See page 70, claim 16). Koyama et al. also teaches food and drinks containing 4,5-dihydroxy-2-cyclopenten-1-one (See page 73, claim 33).

Please note that the recitation of "intended use", e.g., for treating and preventing a disease, or enhancing growth factor production, does not lend patentable weight to composition claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to San-ming. Hui whose telephone number is (703) 305-1002. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon 9:00 to 1:00, Tu - Fri from 9:00 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minna Moezie, J.D., can be reached on (703) 308-4612. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Art Unit: 1617

Page 6

San-ming Hui October 17, 2001

MINNA MOEZIE, J.D.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600